

2004 PROGRESS REPORT

Federal, State, and Tribal Human Services Partnership

PARTNERS

- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Intergovernmental Affairs
- American Public Human Services Association
- National Congress of American Indians

BACKGROUND

In October 2003, the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), the American Public Human Services Association (APHSA), and the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs (IGA) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) mutually agreed to come together equally, in partnership, to examine human service policy and practice as it relates to American Indian children and families both on and off of Indian lands. Because tribes, counties, states, and the federal government play a role in the delivery of social services to American Indian populations, this intergovernmental approach seemed to be the logical method to address issues of mutual concern. Consultations among tribal, state, and local governments, where participants can share information, best practices, and promising approaches has shown to provide more efficient and effective service delivery.

PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

While the three partnering organizations are unique in terms of their respective target audiences, they share commonalities with respect to the collaboration and coordination of human service programs in Indian Country as described below.

- **U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Office of Intergovernmental Affairs (IGA)**
This office serves as the Secretary of Health and Human Service's conduit on human services policy matters concerning state, tribal and local governments, and their respective organizations. The IGA is responsible for ensuring discussions occur between state and tribal partners as part of HHS' Secretarial consultation responsibilities. It also is well-positioned to bring staff of the Administration on Children and Families that administers a majority of human service programs to the initiative. Also, HHS' Regional Directors (RD) will have the opportunity to play an integral part of the process. They will have access to the products produced during the initiative, as well as provide technical assistance upon request.
- **The American Public Human Services Association (APHSA)**
As a membership association, APHSA can draw from its membership, which includes all state and many territorial human service agencies, more than 100 local agencies, and several thousand individuals who work in or otherwise have an interest in human service programs. The APHSA's membership also includes the state commissioners, secretaries of human services, and the directors of many programs such as Child Care, Child Welfare, Child Support, Food Stamps, Information Systems, TANF, and Medicaid. Many of these listed programs have organized into the APHSA affiliate organizations, which hold regular meetings on their specific areas of expertise.
- **The National Congress of American Indians (NCAI)**
As the oldest, largest, and most represented national organization addressing the interests of American Indian tribal governments, NCAI works diligently with elected tribal leadership and human service program directors from the 562 federally-recognized tribes to address a range of human service policy and programmatic issues. The umbrella function and structure of the NCAI also means that regional tribal organizations and national issue-specific tribal organizations are informed by and coordinated with the NCAI's work. The NCAI's committee structure directs particular attention to human service programs

through the work of the Human Resources Committee and, more specifically, the Indian Child and Family Welfare Subcommittee.

PARTNERSHIP GOALS AND ACTIVITIES

At the outset of the joint initiative, the three organizations set forth the following goals:

- Increase collaboration among federal, state, and tribal governments on the implementation of human service program in Indian Country for the purpose of sharing information and innovative ideas, and identifying best practices that can be shared on a national level.
- Increase collaboration among federal, state, and tribal governments to discuss and better inform federal policy proposals and decisions.
- Increase federal, state and tribal understanding of tensions in specific human service policies and programs.
- Develop strategies to locally improve federal, state, and tribal communication and coordination on issues that affect Native families and children.
- Increase tribal participation in the development of policies and plans of state-administered human service programs.
- Expand opportunities for integration for programs that serve tribes at the local level by developing demonstration options and waiver opportunities with incentives that encourage state and local governments to participate.
- Identify tribal representatives with expertise in human services issues who can provide technical assistance to HHS regional staff in support of their tribal coordination, communication and consultation sessions.

The proposed project activities fall into four primary categories: (a) initial planning meeting; (b) tribal/state/federal human services workshop; (c) human service academies; and (d) reports/summaries.

a) **Initial Planning Meeting**

Convene a joint HHS/APHSA/NCAI planning session where participants will finalize the goals and objectives of the initiative for the year. They will also identify the key human service issues to be addressed in joint policy academies, future meetings of the Work Group, various products of the initiative, and possible funding opportunities.

b) **Federal/State/Tribal Human Service Work Group**

As a vehicle to facilitate collaboration between the three entities a Work Group comprised of tribal and state human service administrators and key federal staff (with broad expertise in multiple human service issues areas) will be formed to guide the process. This group will formulate the specific topics to be covered during the academies and be responsible for soliciting and responding to feedback from the broader communities. A “Core Group,” consisting of representatives from each organization will serve as the day-to-day executive committee of the Work Group. The Core Group took responsibility for arranging Work Group conference calls, setting the agenda for these calls and tracking progress on tasks that came out of the calls. The Core Group also worked to identify and prioritize potential policy topics.

c) **Human Service Policy Academies**

One to two-day policy academies will be convened on specific human service program areas where tribal, state, and federal administrators can come together to discuss their respective roles and challenges in providing services to Native children and families. Communication and coordination barriers and ways to overcome them will be highlighted. Particular attention will be focused on programs that may be in the

process of being transitioned from state to tribal administration (e.g., child support). As part of the academies, expert participants will identify opportunities to assist HHS Headquarters and regional staffs that will enhance the ongoing state, tribal, local coordination, communication and consultation sessions.

d) **Reports/Summaries**

Materials and analyses related to the policy academy topics as well as general documents to improve intergovernmental understanding will be produced and disseminated throughout the course of the project. These materials will be available electronically on NCAI's and APHSA's websites and in hard copy as deemed appropriate.

A summary of accomplishments, barriers and progress on current activities will be produced and distributed as needed. Also a final report, which includes outcomes in measurable terms in direct relation to the stated goals and objectives, will be produced. This report will also identify successes of the collaboration and discuss future collaborations.

The HHS Federal, State, and Tribal Human Services Workgroup approved the above-listed goals and project activities.

PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Through the leadership of the Core Group, the Work Group was extremely successful in identifying significant policy topics of mutual interest and bringing joint tribal, state and federal attention to them. In general, the project:

- Raised awareness of the need for and value of intergovernmental collaboration across a broad range of human service issues and the willingness of representatives from all three levels of governments to do so;
- Brought new stakeholders into the conversation, including new departments, programs, and staff from all three organizations; and
- Laid the groundwork for regular, ongoing and formal three-way governmental collaboration.

Specifically, the Work Group executed several activities:

- **Initial Planning Meeting**

The initial project-planning meeting was held in Albuquerque, NM in conjunction with NCAI's Annual meeting on Sunday, November 16, 2003. Over 40 federal, state, and tribal representatives from more than 15 states participated in the meeting. Tribal leaders, representatives from state and local governments as well as federal staff agreed to the creation of a joint Core Group that would vet human services topics and frame the efforts of the Work Group, such as child support enforcement, welfare reform and child welfare. (See Appendix A for a table of issues identified for intergovernmental coordination at the initial project-planning meeting.)

- **Federal, State, and Tribal Human Service Work Group**

The Work Group was formally established in January 2004 and convened four times via conference calls (April 30th, June 3rd, July 15th, and October 7th) to continue examine areas for intergovernmental coordination and identifying opportunities for improving service delivery to tribes. During the conference calls, participants discussed child welfare, child support enforcement, TANF, Medicaid, child care, and Head Start. Participants also gave valuable feedback on collecting and sharing best practices that had demonstrated success. (See Appendix B for a matrix of Work Group members.)

- **Human Service Policy Academies**

While the human service policy academy model peaked a substantial interest, finding common scheduling options for a critical mass of Work Group members to participate in policy meetings proved to be

challenging. Moreover, while TANF was originally identified as policy academy topics, Congress' inability to reauthorize the law lessened the potential for significant policy input on this issue on the part of the Work Group.

Notwithstanding these circumstances beyond the Work Group's control, the Work Group was successful in supporting one human service academy on Child Welfare that was held in Seattle, Washington on August 19-20th, in conjunction with another APHSA-sponsored meeting. At this session, over 40 federal, state, and tribal representatives met to identify the key areas for intergovernmental collaboration and to assess child welfare reform policy proposals for their potential impact on American Indian children and families as well as on state/tribal relationships.

HHS Region X (based in Seattle) had two representatives in attendance, one for Administration for Children, Youth and Families Commissioner Joan Ohl, and the Department of Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs (Central Office). This is particularly noteworthy because the project went beyond its scope by fostering dialogue between federal agencies. State and tribal representatives from 11 states each made brief presentations about the intergovernmental activities/accomplishments that they were most proud of in their respective states. Moreover, some of the states and the tribes within their boundaries communicated in advance of the meeting in order to coordinate joint presentations. Evaluations of the meeting indicated that participants were very excited about the information from the meeting and were eager for further opportunities to discuss and coordinate on child welfare issues.

Discussion about the Project began to spread beyond the boundaries of the Work Group and their respective audiences. For example, the partnership was discussed in a total of 12 HHS ACF consultation sessions, both nationally and regionally. The Partnership was also formally introduced at two national NCAI meetings and a national APHSA meeting. All three organizations disseminated notices about the project, shared the project overview with constituents, and engaged in discussions with stakeholders and constituents about the project goals.

The project was also successful in sponsoring some federal/state/tribal dialogue opportunities outside of the policy academy model. For example, on May 3rd, 2004, after the publication of the final Tribal Child Support Enforcement regulation, HHS Office of Child Support Enforcement Commissioner Sheri Heller and representatives from her staff held an unprecedented 90-minute conference call with tribes and states to review the regulation and take questions about it. In another case, states were invited to the HHS IGA Regional Tribal Consultation Sessions. In some regions, states were invited to listen to tribal testimony before federal representatives, while in other regions, states responded to testimony presented by tribal members.

- **Reports and Summaries**

In conjunction with the project, several reports and meeting summaries were produced and shared among Work Group members:

- A meeting summary from the initial planning meeting;
- Best practices summary for state/tribal collaboration;
- Workgroup conference call summaries;
- Final documents on Tribal Child Support Enforcement regulations and their implications for state/tribal coordination;
- Articles and analyses about state/tribal coordination on TANF;
- Summary of the federal/state/tribal Child Welfare meeting and the associated best practices resources;
- An article entitled "Happy Together: The Story of Collaboration" for the APHSA's Policy and Practice magazine; (See Appendix C for the text of the article.)

CONCLUSION

The “Federal-State-Tribal Human Services Partnership” initiative was an ambitious undertaking from the beginning. However, much progress was made due to the support of the leadership from each participating organization and the steadfast work of the Core Group. Indeed, all three organizations acknowledged a greater acceptance of including tribes and tribal leaders in policy discussions at the state and federal levels. In short, all three groups noted a change in their respective organizational culture with respect to broadening the dialogue.

Throughout the project several opportunities for improving the Work Group’s effectiveness and overall impact were identified. For example, in order to resolve scheduling conflicts that preclude participation in freestanding policy academies, the Core Group will recommend that the Work Group identify previously-scheduled meetings on significant policy topics. The partners learned that many Work Group members attend regularly scheduled national meetings that coincidentally present opportunities for Work Group members to engage in policy discussion. Thus this “piggy-back” option would preserve scarce travel resources for Work Group members while allowing access to meetings on key human services issues.

Continuous efforts in the area of intergovernmental collaboration in human services are paramount by all three parties and by our constituents so that no momentum is lost. In the next phase of the partnership, the constant challenge will be to identify key issues for discussion based on Work Group consensus, identify at least five meetings where Work Group members can “piggy-back,” and utilize all available resources to disseminate information about Work Group activities and accomplishments.

APPENDICES

Appendix A.....	HHS Federal/State/Tribal Human Services Work Group
Appendix B.....	Table of Issues Identified at Initial Planning Meeting
Appendix C.....	Happy Together: The Story of Collaboration

APPENDIX A

HHS Federal, State, and Tribal Human Services Work Group

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
National Congress of American Indians
American Public Human Services Association

Federal, State, and Tribal Human Services Partnership

TRIBAL DELEGATES AND ALTERNATES

Revised December 20, 2004

IHS Area/HHS Region	DELEGATE Tribe or Organization	ALTERNATE Tribe or Organization
Aberdeen Area (Region 7: Kansas City Region 8: Denver)	Carole Anne Heart Aberdeen Area Tribal Chairman's Health 1770 Rand Road Rapid City, SD 57702 PHONE: 605.721.1922 Fax: 605.721.1932 Email: execdir@norcom-at.com	Awaiting Tribal Confirmation
Alaska Area (Region 10 – Seattle)	Jana Turvey Kodiak Area Native Assoc. 3449 E. Rezanof Drive Kodiak, AK 99615 PHONE: 907.486.9802 Fax: 907.486.9889 Email: jana.turvey@kanaweb.org	Mark Andrews Tanana Chiefs Conference 122 1 st Ave., Ste. 600 Fairbanks, AK 99701 PHONE: 907.452.8251 ext. 3235 Fax: 907.459.3953 Email: mark.andrews@tananachiefs.org
Albuquerque Area (Region 6, 8, 9)	No Nomination Submitted	No Nomination Submitted
Bemidji Area (Region 5 – Chicago)	Christine McPherson Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa 2864 Ashmun St, 3 rd floor Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783 PHONE: 906.632.5273 Fax: 906.632.5266 Email: cmcpherson@saulttribe.net	Hattie Walker Ho-Chunk Nation PO Box 636 Black River Falls, WI 54615 PHONE: 715.284.9343 ext. 5051 Fax: 715.284.9592 Email: hwalker@ho-chunk.com
Billings Area (Region 8: Denver)	Gary James Melbourne Fort Peck Tribe PO Box 1027 Poplar, MT 59255 PHONE: 406.768.3491 Fax: 406.768.5780 Email: hlthdir@nemontel.net	Helen Caplett Crow Tribe PO Box 159 Crow Agency, MT 59022 PHONE: 406.638.3930 Fax: 406.638.4042 Email: helenc@crownations.net
California Area (Region 9 – San Francisco)	John P. Carney Riverside-San Bernardino County Indian Health, Inc. 11555 _ Potrero Rd. Banning, CA 92220 PHONE: 909.849.4761 Fax: 909.849.5881 Email: jcarney123@aol.com	Virginia Hill Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians PO Box 1323 Pauma Valley, CA 92061 PHONE: 760.742.0030 Fax: 760.742.0037 Email: seneca7@aol.com

Nashville Area (Region 1 – Boston Region 2 – New York Region 3 – Philadelphia Region 4 – Atlanta)	James T. Martin United South & Eastern Tribes, Inc. 711 Stewarts Ferry Pike, Ste. 100 Nashville, TN 37214 PHONE: 615.872.7900 Fax: 615.872.7417 Email: jtmartin@usetinc.org	Brenda Shore Fuller United South & Eastern Tribes, Inc. 711 Stewarts Ferry Pike, Ste. 100 Nashville, TN 37214 PHONE: 615.872.7900 Fax: 615.872.7417 Email: besshore@usetinc.org
Navajo Area (Region 6 – Dallas Region 8 – Denver Region 9 – San Francisco)	Awaiting Tribal Confirmation Iris Peterson Navajo Division of Social Srv PO Box 4590 Window Rock, AZ 86515 PHONE: 928.871.6837 Fax: 928.871.6278 Email: unknown	Awaiting Tribal Confirmation Virgil Pablo Navajo Division of Social Srvs PO Box 4590 Window Rock, AZ 86515 PHONE: 928.871.6837 Fax: 928.871.6278 Email: unknown
Oklahoma Area (Region 6 – Dallas Region 7 – Kansas City)	Lisa John Chickasaw Nation PO Box 1548 Ada, OK 74821 PHONE: 580.436.7214 Fax: 580.310.6461 Email: lisa.john@chickasaw.net	Norma Merriman Cherokee Nation PO Box 948 Tahlequah, OK 74465 PHONE: 918.456.0671 ext. 2787 Fax: 918.458.7666 Email: nmerriman@cherokee.org
Phoenix Area (Region 8 -Denver Region 9 – San Francisco)	Warren Kontz Intertribal Council of Arizona 2214 N. Central Ave., Ste. 100 Phoenix, AZ 85004 PHONE: 602.307.1508 Fax: 602.258.4825 Email: warren.kontz@itcaonline.com	Mark Lewis Hopi Tribe PO Box 68 Second Mesa, AZ 86043 PHONE: 928.737.2685 Fax: 928.737.2667 Email: lewism@hopi.wf
Portland Area (Region 10 – Seattle)	Robert “Bob”Brisbois Spokane Tribe of Indians P.O. Box 100 Wellpinit, WA 99040 PHONE: 509-258-4581 ext.15 Fax: 509-258-9243 Email: bobbert@spokanetribe.com	Julie Johnson Northwest Indian College PO Box 827 Neah Bay, WA 98357 PHONE: 360.645.2548 Fax: 360.645.2500 Email: juliej@olypen.com
Tucson Area (Region 9 – San Francisco)	Reuben Howard Pascua Yaqui Tribe 7490 South Camino de Oeste Tucson, AZ 85743 PHONE: 520.879.6019 Fax: 520.883.1057 Email: reuben.howard@mail.ihs.gov	Rosemary Lopez Tohono O’odham Nation PO Box 815 Sells, AZ 85634 PHONE: 520.383.6000 Fax: 520.383.3930 Email: lopezr@todhs.com
National Organizations	DELEGATE	ALTERNATE
American Indian Higher Education Consortium	Dr. Jim Shanley Ft. Peck Community College PO Box 398 Poplar, MT 59255 PHONE: 406.768.6300 Fax: 406.768.6301 Email: jshanley@fpcc.edu	Dr. Dave Gipp United Tribes Technical College 3315 University Drive Bismarck, ND 58504 PHONE: 701.255.3285 ext. 8 Fax: 701.530.0605 Email: dmgipp@aol.com

Association of American Indian Physicians	No Nomination Submitted	No Nomination Submitted
National Council of Urban Indian Health	Donna Keeler South Dakota Urban Indian Health 122 E. Dakota Ave. Pierre, SD 57501 PHONE: 605.224.8841 Fax: 605.224.6852 Email: donnak@sduih.org	Georgiana Ignace 15825 Pomona Rd. Brookfield, WI 53005 PHONE: 262.782.0811 Fax: 414.256.1902 Email: none
National Indian Child Care Association	Dee Killion Eastern Shawnee Tribe PO Box 350 Seneca, MO 64865 PHONE: 918.666.2435 ext. 305 Fax: 918.666.2065 Email: deekill@hotmail.com	Laurie Hand Cherokee Nation PO Box 948 Tahlequah, OK 74465 PHONE: 918.458.7613 ext.223 Fax: 918.458.7616 Email: lhand@cherokee.org
National Indian Child Welfare Association	No Nomination Submitted	No Nomination Submitted
National Indian Council on Aging	Frank Chee Willetto 10501 Montgomery Blvd. NE, Ste. 210 Albuquerque, NM 87111 PHONE: 505.292.2001 Fax: 505.292.1922 Email: none	Harriet Rhoades PO Box 91 Fort Bragg, CA 95437 PHONE: 707.964.2647 Fax: 707.964.4371 Email: noyojetty1@earthlink.net
National Indian Head Start Directors	Mavany Verdugo Rincon Head Start PO Box 946 Pauma Valley, CA 92061 PHONE: 760.751.9821 ext. 333 Fax: 760.751.0572 Email: mavany1@aol.com	Lee Turney Leech Lake Head Start 6530 Highway 2 NW Cass Lake, MN 56633 PHONE: 218.335.8256 Fax: 218.335.8255 llhdstrt@paulbunnan.net
National Indian Health Board	Jerry Freddie HCR 63, Box 6070 Winslow, AZ 86047 PHONE: 928.657.3233 Fax: 928.657.2433 Email: jerry.freddie@navajo.org	Francilla Whiteskunk 101 Constitution Ave. NW Ste. 8-B02 Washington, DC 20001 PHONE: 202.742.4344 Fax: 202.742.4285 Email: fwhiteskunk@nihb.org
Papa Ola Lōkahi (Native Hawaiian Health)	Hardy Spoehr 894 Queen St. Honolulu, HI 96822 PHONE: 808.597.6550 ext. 213 Fax: 808.597.6551 Email: hspoehr@papaolalokahi.org	Na'unanikina'u Kamili'i 894 Queen St. Honolulu, HI 96822 PHONE: 808.597.6550 ext. 303 Fax: 808.597.6551 Email: nkamalii@papaolalokahi.org
Tribal Self-Governance Advisory Committee	Melanie A. Benjamin Mille Lacs Band Assembly 43408 Oodena Drive Onamia, MN 56359 PHONE: 800.709.6445 ext. 7479 Fax: 320.532.7505 Email: jmojica@millelacsobwe.nsn.us	Nomination Withdrawn
American Public Human Services Association	Bruce Wagstaff Deputy Director, Children and Family Services Division California Department of Social Services 744 P Street, M.S.	

	17-18 Sacramento, CA 95814	
American Public Human Services Association	Robin Arnold Williams Executive Director Utah Department of Human Services 120 North 200 West #319 Salt Lake City, Utah 84103	
American Public Human Services Association	Mary Nelson Administrator Iowa Division of Adult, Children and Family Services 1305 East Walnut Street 5th Floor Des Moines, Iowa 50319	
American Public Human Services Association	Dr. Lynn V. Mitchell, CMO/Medicaid Director Oklahoma Health Care Authority 4545 N. Lincoln Boulevard Suite 124 Oklahoma City, OK 73105	
Key Point of Contact	Primary	Secondary
HHS Intergovernmental Affairs	Gena Tyner-Dawson 200 Independence Ave. SW, Rm. 630F Washington, DC 20201 PHONE: 202.690.6060 Fax: 202.690.5672 Email: eugenia.tyner-dawson@hhs.gov	James Ivery 200 Independence Ave. SW, Rm. 600E Washington, DC 20201 PHONE: 202.690.6060 Fax: 202.690.5672 Email: james.ivery@hhs.gov
National Congress of American Indians	Jacqueline Johnson 1301 Connecticut Ave. NW, Ste. 200 Washington D.C. 20036 PHONE: 202.466.7767 Fax: 202.466.7797 Email: jjohnson@ncai.org	Sarah Hicks 6221 Rosebury Ave., Apt. #3N Clayton, MO 63105 PHONE: 314.935.5896 Fax: 314.935.8464 Email: shicks@wustl.edu
American Public Human Services Association	Kathryn Dyjak 810 First Street NE, Suite 500 Washington, DC 20002 PHONE: 202.682.0100 ext. 237 Fax: 202.289.6555 Email: kdjak@aphsa.org	

APPENDIX B

Table of Issues Identified at Initial Planning Meeting

Policy Issues

Federal, State, and Tribal Human Services Partnership

During 2004, tribal, state, and federal administrators of human services will come together to discuss four to five specific human service areas of policy and practice as it relates to American Indian communities. The American Public Human Services Association (APHSA), the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) and the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs (IGA) of the US Department of Health and Human Services have agreed to hold joint meetings over the coming months as part of a new initiative entitled “Tribal/State/Federal Partnership.” The intention is to address both federal policy issues as well as issues around implementation of programs.

Office of Intergovernmental Affairs), Department of Health and Human Services

This office serves as the Secretary of Human Service’s conduit on human services policy matters concerning state, tribal and local governments, and their respective organizations. IGA is responsible for ensuring discussions occur between state and tribal partners as part of HHS’ secretarial consultation responsibilities. It also is well positioned to bring colleagues of the department to the initiative such as staff of the Administration on Children and Families that administers a majority of human service programs.

American Public Human Services Association

As a membership association, APHSA can draw from its members that include all state and many territorial human service agencies, and more than 100 local agencies. APHSA membership consists of state commissioners, secretaries of human services and directors of various programs such as Child Care, Child Welfare, Child Support, Information Systems, TANF, and Medicaid.

National Congress of American Indians

As the oldest, largest, and most representative national organization addressing the interests of American Indian tribal governments, NCAI works with elected tribal leadership and human service program directors from the 562 federally-recognized tribes to address a whole range of human service policy and programmatic issues. NCAI’s committee structure also directs particular attention to human service programs through the work of the Human Resources Committee and the Indian Child and Family Welfare Subcommittee.

Identification of Issues (*short list*)

It is now necessary to identify four-five policy issues for this collaboration. However, this hopefully will not preclude smaller collaborative efforts on other issues. In choosing the issues to be addressed, the likelihood of federal legislation and/or regulations was taken into account, as well as issues that would most benefit from the collaboration. No final decisions were made but some of the possible choices included data reporting and systems issues, child welfare, and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program and the Child Support Enforcement program, as they are both part of the TANF reauthorization process and include separate programs and/or regulations for tribal governments. The topics identified fall into two categories. The first category is specific human service programs. The second category is broader, cross cutting issues that impact the entire system.

Category 1: Human Service Areas

Within specific human service areas, the group found many topics within the areas of child support, childcare, child welfare, food stamps, public health and Medicaid, TANF and Medicare Modernization Act that could benefit from tribal/state/federal coordination.

- ***Child Support:*** One of the primary issues identified in this area is the need for the proposed tribal child support regulations to be finalized. States and tribes are being forced to second guess what the federal government will allow or disallow with regards to Tribal child support programs, as the regulations to

implement the 1996 welfare law have not been issued. The final regulations were published on March 30, 2004, which now allows Federally recognized Indian tribes and tribal organizations to apply for funding to operate a comprehensive child support enforcement program. This topic would greatly benefit from state/tribal/federal coordination.

- ***Medicare Modernization Act***

Currently, there is a lot of discussion in the newly passed Medicare Modernization Act. On December 8, 2003, the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act (MMA) of 2003 were signed into law. This landmark legislation provides seniors and people living with disabilities with a prescription drug benefit, more choices and better benefits under Medicare, the most significant improvement to senior health care in nearly 40 years. All Medicare beneficiaries, except those who already receive outpatient drugs through Medicaid, will be able to enroll in a discount card program starting in May 2004. Tribes are requesting an opportunity for CMS to discuss MMA outreach and education to American Indians and Alaska Natives communities.

- ***Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)***

TANF is one of the most developed issue areas going into this initiative due to early collaborations between APHSA and NCAI. Feedback for future discussions focused on the reauthorization of the TANF program and the hope for joint implementation sessions whenever possible to understand the new law and to work together to identify possible implementation strategies. For example, a present proposal includes a provision that states could identify activities that count as work in areas of high unemployment. There was feedback that this initiative could provide an opportunity for tribes, states, and the federal government to further investigate and discuss possible activities that might count as work. There was also hope that, even if agreement could not be reached, it would be helpful to receive clarification on how the federal government determines the amount of a tribal family assistance grant to a new tribe when they take on the administration of TANF in the same service area of an existing Tribal TANF program.

- ***Child Welfare***

There was a lot of feedback from participants on child welfare systems. Issues came up around the Indian Child Welfare Act and its intersection with the Adoption and Safe Families Act, as well as between the IV-E child welfare system and the child support system. Feedback also included the over-representation of Indian youth in the juvenile justice system and barriers that do not allow for alternative approaches that emphasize cultural, religious and tribal practices in working with tribal youth. The lack of direct reimbursement for IV-E foster care and adoption by tribes, limiting the ability of Native children to be placed in permanent homes was raised as an issue. Also, feedback included the need to work jointly through cultural issues that arise in the child welfare system such as the definition of the terms “guardian” and “family”, especially during the termination of parental rights (TPR) process and placement of children outside the home.

Category 2: Broader Cross-Cutting Issues

Several issues were identified that go beyond specific program areas but to the broader human service system. These topics include consultation processes between states and tribes; coordination issues when tribal programs are located across federal, state, and/or county borders; the present void and need for research, best practices, and training in the area of tribal/state human service delivery; and the need for further analysis and reform of human service data reporting and information systems as it relates to federal programs. Each of these topic areas is discussed below.

- ***Data Reporting and Information Systems***

The question of how infrastructures and systems could share data when either there are no systems or incompatible systems in place was raised. The group recognized the need to collect data specific to tribal populations but at the same time did not want to mandate or overly burden either state or tribal programs. The tendency of reporting requirements to dictate the structure of a program and decrease the flexibility

and tribal/state discretion was discussed. The group felt that this cooperative initiative might be a good place to look at issues around the sharing of data, the ability for tribes to use E- government grant submissions, the use of tribally collected data in state and national databases, and data reporting discrepancies that create barriers to attempts to integrate services.

Next Steps

The next steps of the collaboration involve choosing the above issues and beginning the process of identifying the academies and selecting opportunities for those academies.

APPENDIX C

Happy Together: The Story of Collaboration

Happy Together:



coordination between state and tribal governments and human service administrations is complicated. How is that for an understatement? We are sure that that any tribal or state director, case manager or social worker can provide example after example of deep frustrations they have found in working across governments. However, many of these same people can probably also tell you how rewarding and worthwhile it is when a collaboration or joint initiative between our governments works out—not only to the government staff, but more important, to the affected American Indian children and families.

Little girls play at a tribal TANF meeting.

The Story of Collaboration

Intergovernmental coordination is incredibly challenging, with 186 tribes served by tribal TANF programs in 15 states, 76 tribes involved in Title IV-E child welfare agreements in 15 states, and more than 260 tribal child-care grantees serving more than 500 tribes in 34 states. The complexity of relationships will only grow dramatically. Every year additional tribes are considering the administration of TANF. There is pending legislation in Congress that would enable tribes to receive direct reimbursement for Title IV-E expenditures in foster care and adoption. There have also been new opportunities in Medicaid and Food Stamps, with at least a few tribes now determining eligibility for these programs. In addition, the recently released final regulations for the Tribal Child Support program provides up to \$500,000 in two-year grants to tribes for capacity building to run a child support program as well as increased federal match rates for the early years of the program.

Given the increasing parallels and intersections of state and tribal human service programs, many wonder whether every state, county, and tribe or consortium of tribes that administers human services must individually approach one another to develop its own process toward reaching agreements and understanding. Are there models that tribes and states can use as a guide? The answer is yes and no. Because all states and all tribes are so different from one another and have varying relationships, there are no universal models for intergovernmental

tal communication and coordination of programs. However, some general principles and adaptable models do exist.

Principles for Collaboration

In a series of joint publications in 2000 and 2002, the National Conference of State Legislatures and the National Congress of American Indians—a national Indian organization represent-



ing the interests of American Indian and Alaska Native tribal governments—have identified a number of key principles for intergovernmental relationships. These include

- Commitment to cooperation in areas that tribes and states can come together on;
- Mutual understanding and respect;
- Regular and early communication before policies are developed and conflicts arise;

Children play at a child care site at a meeting of tribal TANF recipients served by the Tanana Chiefs' Conference. Child care is provided at almost all of these meetings.

Sarah Hicks, program director,
National Congress of American Indians
Kathryn Dyjak, senior legislative
associate, American Public Human
Services Association

Happy Together:

The Story of Collaboration

A young family gets ready for an evening event. Family entertainment and social events are provided every evening during tribal TANF meetings.



“The Osage Nation and the State of Oklahoma entered into a reciprocal agreement to exchange TANF data, food stamp, medical, and child care information that clients receive. The agreement is designed to prevent duplication of services and to assist the tribal TANF program in complying with federal reporting requirements.”

Ray Lasley, director of human services,
Osage Nation, Oklahoma

- Identifying a process and establishing accountability for addressing issues; and
 - Institutionalizing positive relationships.¹
- Great collaborative work that attends to these principles is occurring in many places.
- In **Alaska**, the tribes and state have worked together for more than two years to develop tribal licensing standards for tribal foster homes. The state sees it as being in its best interest to provide technical assistance to the tribes and Native non-profits, helping them to develop standards that would facilitate such licensing, a job that the state does not have adequate resources to do.
 - In **Arizona**, the state voluntarily shares 7 percent of its Title XX Social Services Block Grant with the 22 Arizona tribes. The base allocation for each tribe is \$13,600, with increases based on population.

The state Department of Economic Security contracts with the Inter Tribal Council of Arizona to plan the home- and community-based services for the elderly, on which the 19 ITCA member tribes have elected to spend their SSBG funds. The three additional Arizona tribes, which are not members of ITCA, use their SSBG funds for children's services.

- In **Minnesota**, the state applied for and was granted a Medicaid waiver that allows tribal TANF programs to contract with the state's Medicaid program, determining Medicaid eligibility for tribal TANF recipients. Currently, the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe determines eligibility for both the state's Medicaid and Food Stamp Program.
- In **Oklahoma**, the state has partnered with the Osage Tribe, the only tribe in the state administering TANF, to provide for a smooth transition of state clients to the tribal pro-


gram, share program staff training opportunities, and contribute state Maintenance of Effort funds to the tribal TANF program.

- In **South Dakota**, the state has worked with the Sisseton Wahpeton Tribe to develop protocols and a memorandum of understanding on jurisdiction and referrals between the state and tribal child support enforcement program.

Barriers to Success

Although there is much to learn from the tribes and states mentioned in the above examples, there are barriers that prevent sharing of such successes. In fact, the need to collect and share practices and experiences from across the country is one of the central facets of a new initiative among NCAI, APHSA, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Intergovernmental Affairs. These agencies are committed to improving the coordination among the three governments in human services, recognizing that there is a void in research and information on best practices between states and tribes on human service delivery. Without the availability of this information, tribes and states would be unable to benefit from the experiences, protocols and processes created by their colleagues. In particular, best practices around consultation practices, data systems, and protocols for transferring the administration of programs to tribal governments should be shared. A critical focus of this new initiative will attempt to bring this information together.

Intergovernmental communication, coordination, and collaboration are tough to initiate and even tougher to institutionalize. Yet the opportunities for and instances of joint human services work are only increasing. For example, for the past three years, the Office of Child Support Enforcement

at the HHS has brought together the administrators from the nine tribes and their corresponding states that are operating a tribal Child Support program through demonstration authority. This workgroup has been able to meet to work through implementation issues between the state and tribe in order for the tribe to successfully administer a program that requires much coordination between both governments on issues of cost recovery, information system sharing and distribution. While each state/tribal relationship will be unique in the way the parties decide to communicate, the extent to which and way they choose to coordinate, and the tools they use to implement their collaborative work, using established principles to govern relationships and examining existing models for their applicability and adaptability may be a good first steps and guiding frameworks. 

For more information on work between APHSA and NCAI and/or to share your experiences in this area, please contact Kathryn Dyjak at kdyjak@aphsa.org or Sarah Hicks at shicks@wustl.edu.

¹ For elaboration on each of these principles, see Chapter 2 of Johnson, S., Kaufmann J., Dossett, J., and Hicks, S. (2002). *Government-to-government: Models of cooperation between states and tribes*. Denver, CO: National Conference of State Legislatures. The Sacred Child Project, sponsored by the United Tribes Technical College (UTTC) in Bismarck, ND, developed a similar set of principles. For a discussion of the UTTC principles, see Schmid, D. (2000). *Potential for Washington State Indian tribes*. Seattle, WA: Casey Family Programs.

“From our perspective, the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe TANF Program is a perfect example of a successful tribal-state partnership.

Together we secured a waiver from HHS that allowed the tribe to administer both the Medicaid and Food Stamp programs. Today we recognize this not only as a program where clients can go for culturally appropriate services, but also as an example of our agency’s strong support of tribal self-governance.”

Commissioner Kevin Goodno,
Minnesota Department of
Human Services